

To view a complete listing of all questions/comment received at the various Carolina North meetings, please visit [Summary of Key Interests - Carolina North Planning Process](#) (pdf) or [Summary of Key Interests - Carolina North Planning Process](#) (MS Word).

Summary of Key Interests
Chapel Hill Town Council Meeting/Work Session
June 8, 2009

The following questions/comments were raised during the Chapel Hill Town Council/UNC-Chapel Hill Board of Trustees Joint Work Session that was held on Monday, June 8, 2009:

Interests Raised by Council Members

- When will the Council hear more information on the mode splits and other transportation impacts?
- What happens with the parking ratios after 800,000 square feet of Carolina North has been built?
- Need some governing language to preserve the Town's ability to constrain parking once development progresses beyond 800,000 square feet.
- At the May 21, 2009, Council-Trustee Work Session, the Council requested an analysis of the first 800,000 square feet of development with constrained parking ratios of 20 and 30%. Have the joint staffs met and had these conversations, and if so, have they agreed that 10% is the only number that they can agree on?
- What happens in say five (5) years when the 800,000 square feet is built? Understand that a new TIA has to be done for the next increment of development; but, how does that get to the point of triggering say a 20% reduction as opposed to a 10% reduction?
- We are looking at trip generation of 20,000 versus 14,000 vehicle trips going from 10% to 40% constrained parking. Not sure why 10% is the only number that works when the principle that this ought to be a multi-modal campus from the outset is the driving principle that the Council has been pursuing for the Town.
- Going to have a lot of trouble supporting this modest constraint (only 10% constrained parking). Not what we have promised our constituents. Don't know how to make it work, but have heard so much from citizens who are concerned about vehicular trip generation. Seems that there is a big qualitative difference between 21,000 and 14,000 vehicle trips that is meaningful to the community. Even going to 20 or 30% makes a big difference, as exhibited on days when schools have delayed closings, you drive around town and it is remarkable how much less traffic there is as 10% of the trips are going to school in the morning, so it is meaningful. Does not believe that 10% constrained parking fulfills the LAC's principles or the principles that the Town came out with.
- Believe that it is reasonable to say in the first phase of development that we are ratcheting parking down, but per the chart in Section 5.8.7 (which appears to include the full 3 million square feet of development program), it looks like 10% constrained parking is the ultimate goal.

Needs to be clearer that the Council can choose to constrain parking by a higher percentage after the first 800,000 square feet of development has occurred.

- Bicycle and pedestrian issues are a big topic of interest. Would like for the Council to have the conversation on the record to try and provide resolution and direction to the staff. The issue has been “what is the level of commitment to off-site improvements, for bicycles in particular, and the ability to get to campus from Carolina North?” Especially given that Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard is not the most desirable corridor. There are issues with the railroad because the Town does not own the railroad and neither does the University. There are issues about the greenway and how we cross Estes Drive Extension. So, there is an interest on the part of at least some of the Council members to have more details regarding how we are going to proceed with bicycle and pedestrian improvements.
- Currently the way we do short term and long term transit planning, we are really talking about transit systems. Believes that a well-designed, integrated, connected bike and pedestrian system can be a significant part of transit in that it can address the kinds of distances that exist between main campus and Carolina North and the various neighborhoods. Can get people out of the car who will not necessarily take the bus. Need to incorporate bike and pedestrian planning and construction in a similar manner as we do currently with the Chapel Hill Transit partnership. Seems that this is more UNC and the Town of Chapel Hill since this is an agreement between those two parties, although would certainly expect that Carrboro would have an interest even though they are not part of the Development Agreement. Certainly Carrboro could also have an agreement with the UNC if that was something that both parties desired. The main point however, is that this issue needs to be looked at and funded as part of the transit plan from Carolina North to and from main campus.
- What makes this approach seem like a good model is that, like Chapel Hill Transit, money can come for bikeways and greenways from the MPO. If the University is not connected in as part of this effort with Chapel Hill Transit then it is harder for the University to understand basic issues such as what more money do we need and where might it come from. Should pursue some sort of mechanism whereby both parties can then advocate specifically for funding for bicycle and pedestrian improvements.
- The addendum to the TIA seems to indicate that the consultant has reviewed various constrained parking scenarios and suggests additional buses to address the potential parking reduction. So, it is clear that we do know how to address constrained parking ratios – it is through an increased number of buses. Thus, although the joint staff members may not think that a constrained ratio of greater than 10% is acceptable for the first 800,000 square feet of development, we can see how it could potentially occur.
- What is the relationship of the charts in the TIA Addendum (that discuss the need for additional buses as the constrained parking ratio increases) to the fiscal equity side of the agreement?
- Is it less expensive to build surface parking at Carolina North than it is to operate Chapel Hill Transit routes?
- The difference between 10 and 20% constrained seems to be nil. What are the constraints that are limiting the ratio to 10%? Why not move it up to 20%? Is it the cost of the park and ride lot improvements that would be needed? Why not pick 20% if there is no other impact other than the cost to improve the park and ride lot? Given that a lot of the variables utilized in the Traffic Impact Analysis are based on assumptions that are subject to revision at a later date, and if the

primary impact is limited to the cost of additional parking and ride lot spaces, then why not have the Development Agreement alternatively reflect a baseline and a 20% constrained parking scenarios so that we can easily incorporate the revised information that will be received in future TIAs - especially when the impact is marginal in so many measures? Is there a reason not to do this?

- It is important for citizens to understand that the Development Agreement is going to evolve over time and that there are trigger points and there are mechanisms embedded in the document that will dictate what happens in the future. There is also going to be a significant amount of public participation involved, but it is a Council choice with regard to how that citizen involvement takes place. However, public participation is not something that belongs in the Development Agreement. There are many places in the document where it says the Town Manager is going to do this, and he is going to do that, and that a short range transit plan is going to be prepared. So, what does a short range transit plan look like from the perspective of the Town? Believe that the Council should adopt some sort of Carolina North policy that discusses citizen involvement. For example, a short range transit plan would be developed and would go to the Transportation Board, and would go to the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Board, and would go to the Greenways Commission and would have a Public Hearing and the Council would formally endorse it. Need to itemize where there is going to be future public involvement as part of this agreement, it would be very helpful at declaring the Council's intentions going forward. Would be more indicative of all of the Town's processes that incorporate citizen involvement and incorporate it in the final decisions that get made.
- What if there is so much activity that is generated through the citizen participation aspect of the review process that we need another person on the Planning Department staff? Is that factored into the next iteration of the fiscal impact study?
- Believe that if additional Town staff activity is created by Carolina-North related work, then this should be measured and subsequently incorporated into the fiscal impacts of the project.
- Supports the NRG recommendation that "no later than 6 months after the Development Agreement is adopted, the Town Manager will submit a detailed plan for public notice and participation during the first 800,000 square footage of build-out to the Town Council."
- Why would the Council put into an agreement with the University something that is in the Council's purview to do more or less of? Does not seem to be the University's business. Agree that the Council should provide ample public participation and transparency, but seems that this is a matter of general practice that does not need to be included in the Development Agreement.
- Does not believe that the Council has any business approving the Carolina North Design Guidelines. How many Council members have read through all 50 pages of the Carolina North Design Guidelines? There is a lot of detail in this document, and some of the maps conflict with other maps and exhibits in the Development Agreement. Does not believe that this document needs to be part of the Agreement. Seems to be opening a can of worms and believes that the Town benefits by leaving the Design Guidelines out of the Agreement.
- There are design standards regarding building height, greenways, street connections that are not consistent with what the Town wants, and alternatively reflect what the University and trustees would like to achieve.

- Can the University unilaterally change the design standards after the Development Agreement is approved?
- Believe that having the design guidelines in the Development Agreement gives the Town more control over Carolina North, so the issue is really reviewing the design guidelines and making sure that the Town is comfortable with what they say.
- Concern was expressed regarding the illustration of a northern access road in some of the exhibits in the University's design standards.
- The proposed Development Agreement clearly states that the northern access road is not allowed as part of the proposed Development Agreement.
- Are there other things in the University's Design Guidelines that are not addressed in the Development Agreement and thus do not conflict with the conditions of the Agreement, however the Council would find them to be objectionable in the future, but since they had been incorporated into the approved agreement by reference, they are going to happen anyway?
- The concern with deleting reference in the Development Agreement to the Design Guidelines however is that you would lose important details that are not captured elsewhere in the Agreement (for example the central greenway, streetscape details, etc.) – important details that you want to have addressed in the Agreement.
- Would like to draw attention to the site plan included in the Design Guidelines as it includes a lot of detail that is not included anywhere else in the Development Agreement. The Council is potentially getting ready to endorse a lot of things that the Council has not yet gone through an iterative process to decide whether or not they are a good idea. One thought is to take it out since the Council is time-constrained. Don't want the Council to leave this information in the Agreement and then regret this oversight later.
- Who on the Town staff has read the University's design guidelines in their entirety, and can provide a summary and/or analysis that highlights potential conflicts and/or areas of concern so that the Council can know whether or not there are areas or specific issues that could be problematic.
- Regarding public participation and if and where it is appropriate, NRG and others have brought up concerns regarding traffic control and construction management plans. Wondered if this is a situation where public participation should be coordinated and arranged through the Manager and the Council, or should be included in the Development Agreement. People seem very concerned about this issue, and understandably so since Carolina North is near at least 5 schools that surround the property. Does not believe that the Manager's initial proposal regarding traffic control and construction management is an adequate response to these citizen concerns. Do not believe that this is something that the Council should wait to work out. Would like to better understand how the Council can include citizen participation in a construction management planning process with more specificity than what has already been provided, especially with regard to such potential traffic conflicts during school hours.
- Section 5.9.3 still reads that "The University shall conduct an annual accounting of the operational and capital fiscal impacts to the Town..." Thought that the Council had agreed that this would be handled in the same manner as Traffic Impact Analyses, and that the Town would pick the consultant who would be performing that annual accounting.

- Regarding Section 5.9.3, what are “substantial negative fiscal impacts to the Town?”
- As part of reviewing the University’s Design Guidelines, it might also be beneficial to have a staff member who has greater familiarity with Council policies and practices to take a look at the Guidelines.
- Regarding the preservation of open space and natural areas, concerned that the first sentence begins “Subject to obtaining any required State of North Carolina approval...” Understands that this means the Council of State will have to ultimately sign off on the dedication of the discussed conservation easements. Feels that the Council needs a “what if” statement in here. Does not support giving the University the opportunity for very dense development without the compensating balance of protecting a significant amount of open space. So, if the conservation easement for the approximately 311 acres does not occur, then all bets are off and several members of the Council will not support moving forward.
- Section 5.5.1, sub-section (e) does specifically state that a copy of the recorded conservation easement has to be submitted to the Town Manager prior to the issuance of the initial site development permit. So, if a recorded conservation easement is not submitted, then the initial site development permit would not be issued and everyone would have to go back to the drawing board.
- Is it possible that the staff response to the NRG petition be completed prior to the June 16th Council-Trustee meeting? How can these suggestions be considered and incorporated in a timely manner for Council consideration?

Interests Raised by Citizens

- Would like to get further clarity as to whether the NRG’s proposed amendments to the Development Agreement have been addressed in the June 4th draft. Would like to get this clarification prior to the Public Information Meeting scheduled for June 11, 2009.
- The NRG has recommended that agreement call for a Carolina North Citizen’s Advisory Committee to track and report to Council, to ensure that the public participates in the implementation of this agreement. Based on talks with individual Council members, NRG has decided to withdraw this request and instead bring a petition requesting that the Council map out a plan for involving the public. The NRG agrees that this element is better placed outside the contractual agreement, and would read as follows: “No later than 6 months after the agreement is adopted, the Town Manager would submit a detailed plan for public notice and participation during the first 800,000 square footage of build-out to the Town Council.”
- NRG believes that a guiding principle in the process needs to be that the number of new vehicles on the road generated by Carolina North should not get ahead of the infrastructure necessary to accommodate them. The current language in the draft Development Agreement is a step in the right direction, but remains problematic. The current language specifies that the first series of transportation improvements must be completed by the end of the first 800,000 square feet of build-out. According to the transportation impact analysis, a number of intersections will likely fail prior to the 2015 800,000 square foot milestone. So, as currently written, NRG is concerned that key intersections of our communities could be failing and yet we could still be a year or more away from the deadline for improvements. NRG is instead recommending that occupancy of buildings at Carolina North be linked to the Levels of Service for those intersections. If the

Level of Service drops below D during construction out to 800,000 square feet then additional building occupancy would be suspended until enough improvements can be made to raise the Level of Service back to D or higher. This is not an ideal safety net for our community because something has to fail before mitigation measures kick in. NRG is recommending an additional trigger that may help identify issues before they become problems – that the University update its estimated increase in total building occupancy regarding trips generated and total vehicles on existing roads before each building permit is issued. Those estimates can then be compared against the estimates provided for the TIA. If they exceed the estimates, then the need for an additional update to the TIA would be considered.

- Regarding the frequency of updates to the TIA, the NRG understands why the next update to the TIA has been postponed until 2015. Updates to the TIA will become increasingly important in the years following 2015. NRG would like to see more details about how the updates scheduled beyond 2015 will be developed and the extent to which citizens will have a role in establishing it and the NRG is making similar recommendations regarding parking ratios and how targets for development beyond the first 800,000 square feet will be established.
- Regarding developing a master plan for bicycling and pedestrian paths, the NRG thinks that the revised language included in about four different sections of the most recent draft of the Development Agreement is quite good, however believe it could use some improvement. Specifically, the NRG is concerned that a connection at a fairly early stage is established between Carolina North and the main campus. Would like to see a biking path that is not a bicycle drawn on the road or a white line on Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard, rather it is something different than that – something that thousands of people would want to use for commuting between the two campuses. NRG believes that this is really important and that the Council could make sure that the Development Agreement requires this to happen at some early stage that Carolina North then suddenly becomes this incredibly sustainable and admirable project that we all want it to be.
- Regarding “safeguards to neighborhoods” issues, the NRG still has a couple of issues that have not been addressed. Prior to the agreement being signed – and this is a contract, and most anything can be put in a contract, so we are not subject to the normal limits of a special use permit – if the University and the Town do not plan to make any eminent domain or takings in the process of building the campus or widening roads, then why not just say so. Why can this not be specified in the agreement? At the very least, would like to see the Town Manager initiate a Public Hearing.
- Regarding “School Safety and Neighborhoods,” some additional wording regarding school construction was added in the June 4th draft of the Development Agreement, but it is very vague. The NRG would like to add something more specific like “limit construction vehicles on local road ways during school bus hours.”
- The staff has reassured the NRG that they think they can deal with NCDOT to make improvements for pedestrians to cross roads. We are going to have a lot of roads to cross because a lot of these roads are going to be widened at intersections. So, the NRG sees that maybe this does not belong in the agreement, but still implores the Council to find and reassure themselves that a crosswalk for example on Seawell School Road, or wherever it is needed, can be built because these are State-owned roads and we all know that dealing with NCDOT is sometimes problematic.

- Sedimentation is still a concern. The language in the most recent draft of the Development Agreement looks pretty good, but what is needed is an on-site person. As dirt is moved out of Carolina North every day, an inspector needs to be out there every day to oversee earth-moving and construction activities. Otherwise, there are problems, even when people have the best intentions. So, the NRG requests that the Town approach the University and ask for a person from the University or someone that they would hire to perform this function.

Interests Raised by Citizens (Written)

The following written information was distributed at the June 8th Council Meeting by representatives of the Neighbors for Responsible Growth (see below):

Neighbors for Responsible Growth
Carolina North Development Agreement
Proposed Transportation Amendments
 Submitted during June 8, 2009 Town Council Meeting

Issue	Section	6/5/09 draft language	Status	Recommended language	Rationale / Questions
<p>1. Link construction and building occupancy to completion of transportation improvements.</p>	<p>5.8.13</p>	<p>Cost and Schedule for Additional Improvements. The University shall either design and install or reimburse the Town for the cost of design and construction of the transportation and traffic improvements set forth in Section 5.8.C of this Agreement. These improvements are not required to be installed prior to the completion of 400,000 square feet of floor area development within the Carolina North Project, but shall be completed prior to the completion of 800,000 square feet of floor area development within the Carolina North Project unless otherwise required in this Section or approved by the Town Manager.</p>	<p>?</p>	<p>If the LOS for any intersection within the TIA study boundary drops below D during the period between TIA updates, additional building occupancy at Carolina North will be suspended until the Town and University will consider the need for an additional TIA update. No additional building occupancy will occur until the public facilities necessary to raise level of service to a minimum of D are fully implemented.</p>	<p>Development milestones need to be formally linked to transportation improvements in order to ensure that the improvements precede negative project impacts. Keeping infrastructure improvements ahead of project impacts should be a guiding principle for the Development Agreement. The current language only states that the transportation improvements must be completed by the <i>end</i> of 800K square feet of build-out. According to the TIA, a number of intersections will likely fail <i>prior</i> to the 2015/800K sf milestone. As written, the implementation of transportation improvements could be a year or more behind failing intersections.</p>
<p>2. Update TIA every 3 years or as needed</p>	<p>5.8.8</p>	<p>Transportation Impact Analyses. c. Subsequent updates. An updated TIA shall be submitted in December 2015 or when the total built square footage with the Carolina North Project reaches 800,000 square feet of total building floor space, whichever occurs first. Thereafter, additional TIA updates shall be submitted upon a schedule mutually agreed upon by the Town and University, provided that an update shall be submitted no less frequently than every five years.</p>	<p>?</p>	<p>Transportation Impact Analyses. c. Subsequent updates. An updated TIA shall be submitted in December 2015 or when the total built square footage with the Carolina North Project reaches 800,000 square feet of total building floor space, whichever occurs first. Thereafter, additional TIA updates shall be submitted upon a schedule mutually agreed upon by the Town and University, provided that an update shall be submitted no less frequently than every five years. An updated schedule covering the next increment of 800K square feet of total building floor space will be established before any additional building permits are issued. The proposed schedule will be made available for public comment at least 1 month before the schedule is agreed to.</p>	<p>The previous draft called for an update to the TIA in 2012. Lengthening the time between updates puts additional pressure on the assumptions made by the Town and University that inform the 2009 TIA, and makes the proposed language in Section 5.8.13 even more important.</p> <p>This language puts off the issue of a TIA update schedule for development after 2015. The proposed language attempts to establish some process for establishing future schedules.</p>

3. Link occupancy, trip, and vehicle estimates to consideration of TIA updates.	<i>Not addressed</i>	NA		Before each new TIA update is considered and before each new building permit is issued, the University should present the Town with the estimated increase in total building occupancy, trip generation and total vehicles (on existing collector or local roads) for the period or increment of construction. If the estimates provided before each new building permit is issue exceed the estimates provided for the most recently updated TIA, the Town and University will consider the need for an additional TIA update. No additional occupancy will occur until the determination has been made.	Occupancy in buildings at Carolina North will drive the demand for transportation, and may vary considerably among buildings (depending on use). The trigger outlined in Issue #1 of this report requires mitigation only after intersections have failed. This additional safety net seeks to identify some problems before they occur by tracking occupancy, new trips and total vehicles across the building permit process. The proposed language allows the University to change its plans at any time, but provides citizens with adequate safeguards when that happens.
4. Solicit public input on local conditions	<i>Not addressed</i>			Three months before the end of the lifetime for each TIA update, public concerns and perceptions on local traffic conditions and pedestrian and bicycle safety will be solicited by the Town. The results will be made public in accordance with those recommendations.	Input collected by Neighbors for Responsible Growth from more than 600 residents in April/May 2009 was used by the Town to supplement its analysis of the TIA. Collecting this information <i>before</i> each update of the TIA will help inform assumptions and identify problem areas. Soliciting regular public opinion on traffic and safety conditions will also serve as point of citizen engagement with the development process, and set the parameters of the TIA.
5. Ensure accountability	5.8.8.a.	Each TIA shall consider transit, traffic, bicycle, and pedestrian transportation and shall address the accuracy of the projections and assumptions in previous TIAs for this Project.			These reports will function as “report cards” on the Town’s transportation planning process. Multiple TIAs allow us the opportunity to learn from our mistakes and make corrections. Making this information available to the public ensures a transparent process.
6. Include bicycling metrics	<i>Need additional information</i>			For all future traffic impact analyses extend bicycle performance metrics to the boundary of the study area.	Bicycling is an important transportation mode. Keeping track of biking safety needs to extend beyond intersections located ½ mile from Carolina North. t

<p>7. Ensure that biking facilities are built</p>	<p><i>Need additional information</i></p>		<p>?</p>	<p>Each SRTP shall be made in consideration of and be consistent with the Long Range Transportation plan in effect at the time of each SRTP update. Each SRTP shall consider applicable regional transportation plans and programs, the Town's comprehensive plan, a pedestrian and biking facilities plan, and all other adopted plans and policies affecting potential development in the areas affected by the Carolina North Project that are in effect at the time of each SRTP update. Parties to this agreement shall make reasonable efforts to include all of the transportation analyses and plans required pursuant to this Agreement to consult with and involve the Town of Carrboro, the Chapel Hill-Carrboro school system, other regional and local government entities, neighborhood groups, and the public.</p>	<p>G.8.8.(d) Amend Improved language in 5.8.18, 5.16.7; only one facility needs to be completed by 400,000; without interim goals could take 20 years for one facility to be built. Public and Ped and bike Advisory Committee needs to be consulted by Manager.</p> <p>We had recommended that a master biking facilities plan be part of the SRTP or the TIA. Biking and ped facilities should be integrated into this Agreement. We propose as an alternative that this language be placed in the General Provisions.</p>
<p>8. Ensure safe pedestrian access</p>	<p><i>Need additional information</i></p>		<p>?</p>	<p><i>Pedestrian improvements must be linked to building permits.</i></p>	<p>A master pedestrian plan would offer safe mobility to walkers and bus riders crossing the street and is an integral part of progressive transportation planning. Including a pedestrian and a biking plan in the SRTP ensures that biking and pedestrian facilities, and signaled cross-walks and pedestrian overpasses are built crossing Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard between the campus and Weaver Dairy Road.</p>
<p>9. Ensure improvements to protect neighborhoods are built—a technical edit</p>				<p>add improvements before the Development Agreement is agreed to by May 1, with thresholds, timing, and parking ratios. These may include traffic calming measures in adjacent neighborhoods; minor intersection improvements such as turn lanes if warranted; transit measures that are consistent with LRTP plan; traffic signal improvements; pedestrian and bicycle amenities, etc. Separate parking ratios are being studied for each major land use category within the Carolina North development and may be incorporated into the Agreement.</p>	<p>Town planning staff have made it clear that they are revising the TIA to reflect their own understanding of local traffic conditions and challenges. Including only recommended improvements made by May 1 would appear to suggest that only the recommendations made by the consultant are important.</p>
<p>10. Plan for a parking ratio target of 30%</p>	<p>5.8.7</p>	<p>Individual site development permit applications through</p>	<p>?</p>	<p>Individual site development permit applications through 800,000 square feet of total building space</p>	<p>We applaud the target of 10% constrained parking ratios by 800K square feet</p>

<p>constrained by the end of 3 million square feet build-out.</p>		<p>800,000 square feet of total building space in the Carolina North Project shall demonstrate that parking ratios and the number of parking spaces at Carolina North are consistently between the baseline and 10% constrained ratios as identified in the May 2009 Carolina North Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) (set out below), subsequent TIA updates, or as approved by the Town Manager.</p>		<p>in the Carolina North Project shall demonstrate that parking ratios and the number of parking spaces at Carolina North are consistently between the baseline and 10% constrained ratios as identified in the May 2009 Carolina North Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) (set out below), subsequent TIA updates, or as approved by the Town Manager. Updated targets covering the next increment of 800K square feet of total building floor space will be mutually agreed upon by the Town and University before any additional building permits are issued. The proposed schedule will be made available for public comment at least 1 month before the schedule is agreed to.</p>	<p>of building floor space, but would like to see more specificity about how parking ratio targets will be established after 800,000 square feet.</p>								
<p>11. Master Plan for bicycling Add Improved language in 5.16.6, 5.16.7, 5.16.13, but intermediate goals are lacking. It is possible that at end of 20 years, we could have built no facilities.</p>	<p><i>Need additional information</i></p>		<p>?</p>	<p>We recommend that the Development Agreement require a master plan to be developed by the Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Committee with input from UNC. This plan will include off-road bicycle paths and adequate on-road bicycle lanes that meet two needs: <u>(1) connect Carolina North to the main campus, and (2) provide bicycle access from Carolina North to other parts of Chapel Hill and Carrboro to the east, north, and west.</u> This plan should be tied to building square footage – see below. A bicycle path – preferably off-road, avoiding main roads as much as possible, and avoiding unnecessary hills – should be completed simultaneously with the first stage of construction of Carolina North. The bike and pedestrian improvements must be complete at the end of the first phase.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="850 1486 1230 1738"> <thead> <tr> <th>Development increment</th> <th>% of biking and ped infrastructure</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Innovation Center</td> <td>--</td> </tr> <tr> <td>First 800K sq feet</td> <td>Complete #1 above</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3 million sq feet</td> <td>Complete #2 above</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Development increment	% of biking and ped infrastructure	Innovation Center	--	First 800K sq feet	Complete #1 above	3 million sq feet	Complete #2 above	<p>There is no plan in the Agreement for providing off road bicycle paths between the main campus and Carolina North, nor is there any mention of bicycle paths connecting Carolina North to other parts of Chapel Hill. Overpasses and crosswalks to ensure safe pedestrian movement must be part of a plan that will encourage walkers. Without a plan imbedded in the agreement for bicycle and pedestrian facilities, we won't get people out of their automobiles.</p>
Development increment	% of biking and ped infrastructure												
Innovation Center	--												
First 800K sq feet	Complete #1 above												
3 million sq feet	Complete #2 above												
<p>12. Narrow focus area to TIA boundaries and issue annual report to public on bike and pedestrian</p>	<p><i>Not addressed</i></p>		<p>?</p>	<p>A report on statistics and locations for vehicular crashes involving pedestrians, pedestrians on bicycles, property or other vehicles within the boundary area of the Carolina North TIA should be produced and included in the annual report (5.27.4).</p>	<p>Adopting a metric for pedestrian and bicycle safety will help the Town and the public evaluate pedestrian safety improvements and identify areas that may need additional facilities. This</p>								

incidents.					information is already tracked by the Town. The only additional step would be to narrow the area focus of the available statistics. Accident trends are also included in each TIA update, but accident reports should be provided annually.
13. Ensure public input throughout Carolina North project	5.8.11	Public Notice and Participation. The Town Manager shall take reasonable steps to broadly publicize and provide opportunities for public consultation and participation in all of the transportation analyses and plans mandated by this Agreement.	?	Public Notice and Participation. The Town Manager shall take reasonable steps to broadly publicize and provide opportunities for public consultation and participation in all of the transportation analyses and plans mandated by this Agreement. No later than six months after the Agreement is adopted, the Town Manager will submit a detailed plan for public notice and participation during the first 800K square footage of build-out to the Town Council.	We believe that the Town should build on the strategies that it has used for public participation and input to date. Future plans should include greater advanced notice, more interactive methods, and should leverage online tools and communities.
14. Ensure accountability	See Issue #13		?	Reporting: Make UNC and Town periodic reports available at the Town web site.	Making town reports widely available builds confidence in transparent government.
15. Ensure public participation	See Issue #13		?	<p><u>The Town will ensure that the public participates in each of the following key decision points through public hearings and informational meetings:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA).</u> - <u>short-range transit plans</u> - <u>Traffic management plans</u> - <u>Fiscal agreements</u> - <u>other key milestones in the transportation planning process</u> - <u>approval of the construction plans</u> - <u>information on road connections subject to the approval of the Town Manager</u> - <u>approval of stream restoration projects</u> - <u>maintain a list of minor modifications on the Town website</u> - <u>let public know how their input was, or was not, utilized.</u> 	The Carolina North citizens' advisory committee would track and report to Council on this list to ensure that the public participates in the implementation of the Development Agreement.
16. Participation	See Issue #13		?	Engage the Town of Carrboro more actively in transportation planning decisions by specifying that Carrboro officials be consulted in each of the above key decision points.	The Town needs to establish a mechanism to include elected leaders from Carrboro more fully into transit planning decisions. Partners Transit

					collaboration needs to be increased.
17. Safeguards for Neighborhoods Not an issue to include in the Development Agreement.	NA			The Town of Chapel Hill needs to develop a mechanism with DOT to ensure that traffic calming needed on state owned streets is built.	The Town has assured that it they can work well with DOT to get their support from the State DOT for traffic improvements on state owned streets.
18. Safeguards for Neighborhoods	<i>Not addressed</i>		?	Parties to this agreement will not use eminent domain actions for private property. The Town Manager will recommend calling a public hearing for any road improvements affecting neighborhoods.	We should avoid past conflicts between the Town and UNC on eminent domain actions.
19. Safeguards for Neighborhoods	Include in Agreement Status?			The parties will minimize widening of roads and new road constructions as a means to addressing traffic congestion.	This principle should be built into the Agreement.
20. Safeguards for Neighborhoods	Include in Agreement Language added to TIA		?	Limit construction vehicles on local road ways during school bus hours.	The safety of school children cannot be compromised by construction activity.
21. Safeguards for Neighborhoods	Include in Agreement Done 6/4 we are satisfied with the new language		?	Ensure that traffic calming measures are built in neighborhoods.	How will the public know that there will be adequate funding for traffic calming? How will the Council protect public safety if DOT will not allow traffic calming devices on DOT roads?